

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION**

TONY K. MCDONALD, JOSHUA B.  
HAMMER, and MARK S. PULLIAM,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RANDALL O. SORRELS, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-00219-LY

**NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES**

In support of their motion for partial summary judgment on liability (ECF No. 6), Plaintiffs argue that *Keller v. State Bar of California*, 496 U.S. 1 (1990), and *Lathrop v. Donohue*, 367 U.S. 820 (1961), “do not foreclose Plaintiffs’ challenge to compelled bar membership in light of the Bar’s extensive political and ideological activities” because “[n]othing in either *Keller* or *Lathrop* holds that a state can compel bar membership *when a bar engages in political and ideological activities.*” Pls.’ Reply in Supp. Mot. for Summ. J. 2-3 (May 31, 2019), ECF No. 63 (emphasis in original). On January 13, 2020, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana rejected that exact argument in a case involving the Louisiana State Bar Association. *See Boudreaux v. La. State Bar Ass’n*, No. 2:19-cv-11962, slip op. at 53-56 (E.D. La. Jan. 13, 2020).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The plaintiff’s argument in *Boudreaux* is nearly identical to the Plaintiffs’ argument in this case. Compare Pl.’s Opp’n to Defs.’ Mot. Dismiss at 2, *Boudreaux v. La. State Bar Ass’n*, No. 2:19-cv-11962 (E.D. La. Oct. 25, 2019), ECF. No. 20 (“In *Keller v. State Bar of California*, 496 U.S. 1, 17 (1990), the Court expressly declined to address whether attorneys may ‘be compelled to associate with an organization that engages in political or ideological activities beyond those for which mandatory financial support is justified under the principles of *Lathrop* [*v. Donohue*, 367 U.S. 820 (1961)] and *Abood* [*v. Detroit Board of Education*, 431 U.S. 209 (1977)].”), with Pls.’ Reply in Supp. Mot. Summ. J. 3 (“[T]he Supreme Court reserved that very question in *Keller*, declining to address ‘in the first instance’ whether an individual can ‘be compelled to associate with an organization that engages in political or ideological activities beyond those for which mandatory

In *Boudreaux*, the district court granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss, holding that the plaintiff’s claim that mandatory membership in the Louisiana Bar violated his First and Fourteenth Amendment rights to free association and free speech was “foreclosed by the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Lathrop* and *Keller*,” and that *Janus v. American Federation of State, County, & Municipal Employees*, 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018), did not overrule those decisions. Slip op. at 54-56. In so holding, the court concluded that the Supreme Court “has already answered the question . . . whether states can condition the right to practice law in the state on membership in the state bar association and the payment of dues . . . in the affirmative.” *Id.* at 55. The court’s opinion is attached to this notice.

There have been several additional developments in other cases challenging integrated state bars since the Court held oral argument in this case on August 1, 2019.<sup>2</sup> First, after the Eighth Circuit once again affirmed the district court’s grant of summary judgment in favor of the State Bar Association of North Dakota in *Fleck v. Wetch*, 937 F.3d 1112 (8th Cir. 2019), the plaintiff filed a petition for a writ of certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court on November 21, 2019. *See Fleck v. Wetch*, No. 19-670 (U.S.). The certiorari petition is attached. The defendants’ response is currently due by February 3, 2020.

Second, on December 11, 2019, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin dismissed a similar case against the State Bar of Wisconsin, concluding that the

---

financial support is justified under the principles of *Lathrop* and *Abood*.” (quoting *Keller*, 496 U.S. at 17)).

<sup>2</sup> The developments discussed here are not exhaustive. Other cases involving the state bar associations of Oklahoma, Oregon, and Michigan, and Wisconsin also remain pending in federal trial or appellate courts. *See Schell v. Williams*, No. 5:19-cv-00281-HE (W.D. Okla.); *Crowe v. Or. State Bar*, No. 19-35463 (9th Cir.); *Gruber v. Or. State Bar*, No. 19-35470 (9th Cir.); *Taylor v. State Bar of Mich.*, No. 1:19-cv-00670-RJJ-PJG (W.D. Mich.); *File v. Kastner*, No. 2:19-cv-01063-LA (E.D. Wis.).

plaintiffs' First Amendment claims were barred by *Keller*. See *Jarchow v. State Bar of Wis.*, No. 19-CV-266-BBC, 2019 WL 6728258, at \*\*1-2 (W.D. Wis. Dec. 11, 2019). On December 23, the Seventh Circuit summarily affirmed the district court's decision, holding that the district court "correctly held that the [plaintiffs'] claims are foreclosed by *Keller*." *Jarchow v. State Bar of Wis.*, No. 19-3444, slip op. at 1 (7th Cir. Dec. 23, 2019). On December 31, the plaintiffs filed a petition for a writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court. See *Jarchow v. State Bar of Wis.*, No. 19-831 (U.S.). The defendants' response is currently due by February 3, 2020. The opinions of the district court and the Seventh Circuit, as well as the certiorari petition, are attached.

Dated: January 15, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Joshua S. Johnson (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 State Bar No. 24070002  
 Morgan A. Kelley (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 State Bar No. 1617261  
 VINSON & ELKINS LLP  
 2200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
 Suite 500 West  
 Washington, DC 20037  
 Tel: (202) 639-6623  
 Fax: (202) 879-8934  
 joshjohnson@velaw.com  
 mkelley@velaw.com

/s/ Thomas S. Leatherbury  
 Thomas S. Leatherbury  
 State Bar No. 12095275  
 VINSON & ELKINS LLP  
 2001 Ross Avenue  
 Suite 3900  
 Dallas, TX 75201  
 Tel: (214) 220-7792  
 Fax: (214) 999-7792  
 tleatherbury@velaw.com

Patrick W. Mizell  
 State Bar No. 14233980  
 VINSON & ELKINS LLP  
 1001 Fannin Street  
 Suite 2500  
 Houston, TX 77002  
 Tel: (713) 758-2932  
 Fax: (713) 615-5912  
 pmizell@velaw.com

*Counsel for Defendants*

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on January 15, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing Notice of Supplemental Authorities with the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas by using the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

William S. Consovoy  
Jeffrey M. Harris  
Cameron T. Norris  
Consovoy McCarthy Park PLLC  
3033 Wilson Blvd., Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22201  
Tel: (703) 243-9423  
Fax: (703) 243-9423  
will@consovoymccarthy.com  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Tony K. McDonald,  
Joshua B. Hammer, and Mark S. Pulliam*

Cynthia A. Morales  
Office of the Attorney General  
P.O. Box 12548, Mail Code 009  
Austin, TX 78711  
Tel: (512) 936-1414  
cynthia.morales@oag.texas.gov  
*Counsel for Amicus Curiae Texas Attorney  
General Ken Paxton*

Matthew R. Miller  
Goldwater Institute  
500 E. Coronado Rd.  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-1543  
Tel: (602) 462-500  
litigation@goldwaterinstitute.org  
*Counsel for Amicus Curiae Goldwater  
Institute*

Jason M. Panzer  
Lauren B. Ross  
Herring & Panzer, LLP  
1411 West Avenue, Suite 100  
Austin, TX 78701  
Tel: (512) 320-0665  
Fax: (512) 519-7580  
jason@herringpanzer.com  
*Counsel for Amicus Curiae Texas Legal  
Ethics Counsel*

Charles "Chad" Baruch  
Randy Johnston  
Johnston Tobey Baruch, P.C.  
P.O. Box 215  
Addison, TX 75001  
Tel: (214) 741-6260  
Fax: (214) 741-6248  
chad@jtlaw.com  
*Counsel for Amici Curiae Former Presidents  
of the State Bar of Texas et al.  
Counsel for Amici Curiae Concerned  
Lawyers of Color*

Macey Reasoner Stokes  
J. Mark Little  
910 Louisiana Street  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel: (713) 229-1369  
Fax: (713) 229-7869  
macey.stokes@bakerbotts.com  
*Counsel for Amicus Curiae Texas Access to  
Justice Commission*

/s/ Thomas S. Leatherbury  
Thomas S. Leatherbury  
*Counsel for Defendants*